



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,236	09/27/2002	Tsai-Sheng Chiu	IEIP0003USA	9438
27765	7590	09/20/2004		EXAMINER
				DINH, TUAN T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2841

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,236	CHIU, TSAI-SHENG	
	Examiner Tuan T Dinh	Art Unit	2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Note: Examiner is considered that the term "slot, connector, or bus" is the same meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US 6,147,863) in view of Shu et al. (US 6,400,843).

As to claim 3, Moore et al. discloses a computer backplane (2), see figure 1, column 4, and line 20, comprising:

a PCI expansion slot (16), column 4, line 25, disposed on the backplane (2);
a first expansion slot (a ISA connector 14), column 4, line 25, disposed on the backplane (2), in alignment with the PCI expansion slot (16) to allow that the CPU interface card (8) is able to be connected simultaneously into both of the PCI slot and the first slot (ISA connector 14); and

a second expansion slot (ISA connector 4), column 4, lines 21-22, having an extension of electricity of the first slot.

It is noted that Moore et al. does not specifically disclose first and second AGP expansion slots as claimed in the claim 3. However, it is well known in the art of a computer backplane that the AGP slots are one of specific types of ISA slots/connectors/buses. Further, Shu et al., that discloses an ISA bus such as AGP bus, see column 5, lines 45-48 for improving the speed of display.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an ISA bus such as an AGP bus as taught by Shu et al. to modify the computer backplane of Moore et al. for the purpose of providing a higher bandwidth bus to improve the speed of display.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. ('863) and Shu et al. ('843) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Prior art, figure 1 (submitted by applicant, hereafter APA).

As to claim 4, Moore et al. and Shu et al. does not disclose an AGP interface card comprises gold fingers.

APA shows an AGP card in figure 1 comprising gold fingers.

It would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a circuit card (AGP card) having gold fingers in the computer backplane of Moore et al. and Shu et al., as taught by APA for the purpose of providing excellent conductivity for electrical connection.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues:

(a) Neither the PICMG specification nor Moore teach or suggest "the concept of disposing a PCI slot and an AGP slot in alignment on a board" and also, "PICMG standard does not meet a PCI-AGP arrangement because the different of pin to electricity layout on the board".

It is incorrect. Moore ('863) discloses a PCIMG standard having PCI-ISA slots arrangement and a CPU card (column 1, lines 20-22), it is clearly shown in figure 1 that the PCI is in alignment with ISA slot. Even though, Moore does not specifically disclosed the ISA slot is an AGP slot, but it is well know in the art of a computer technology industry that the AGP slot is one of the specific type of the ISA slot that being used in order to provide a higher bandwidth bus for the speed of display. Therefore, Moore clearly disclose in figure 1 that the PCI slot is in alignment with the ISA/AGP slot in physical connection of the connectors/slots/buses structure on a board.

Further, Shu ('843) teaches the use of a ISA slot/bus as well as a higher bandwidth bus conforming in some standard such as VESA, PCI, or AGP standards (see column 5, lines 44-46). Therefore, the ISA bus/slot can be interchangeable with the AGP bus/slot. Thus, the teaching of Shu to modify the ISA bus/slot of Moore that would meet the standard of PCI-AGP arrangement.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Dinh
September 14, 2004.



KAMAND CUNEOP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800